Programs
Branch
User
Report

#1984-51

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF THE CANADIAN URBAN VICTIMIZATION SURVEY

BY

STATISTICS DIVISION

Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada

Secretariat

87-04397/

#1984-51

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF THE CANADIAN URBAN VICTIMIZATION SURVEY

BY

STATISTICS DIVISION

This working paper was prepared by the Statistics Division, Programs Branch, Ministry of the Solicitor General. This report may not be published, cited or reproduced without permission of the Ministry.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF THE CANADIAN URBAN VICTIMIZATION SURVEY

The Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (1982) provides us with the most extensive Canadian information yet produced concerning the extent of reported and unreported crime during 1981, the impact of criminal victimization, public perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system and several other important concerns.(1)

To develop a methodology for conducting victimization surveys in Canada, three major pretests were conducted. The initial pretest was conducted in Edmonton and had, as its primary purpose, a comparison of personal and telephone interviewing techniques. The results of the Edmonton study indicated that data collected over the telephone were comparable to data obtained by the far more costly method of in-person interviews. The second pretest was conducted in Hamilton to test and to refine the telephone interviewing procedures. This research led to the telephone interviewing procedures used in the final pre-test, the Greater Vancouver Victimization Survey (1979).

---

(1) The five major themes addressed in the survey include;
   a) the extent and distribution of certain crimes;
   b) the risk of criminal victimization;
   c) the impact of criminal victimization;
   d) public perceptions of crime and the criminal justice system;
   e) victims' perceptions and need.

The Canadian Urban Victimization Survey was conducted in early 1982 by Statistics Canada interviewers. Telephone interviews were held with large representative samples of residents(2)aged 16 and older in seven Urban Centres: Greater Vancouver, Edmonton, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Halifax-Dartmouth and St. John's.(3) Because of the very low incidence of some types of crime (such as sexual assault), very large samples are required to ensure that enough cases are "caught" to be statistically representative of all actual cases in the community under study. Sample sizes ranged from 6,910 in one city to 9,563 in another, with 61,050 interviews completed overall. On the basis of these interviews, statistical estimates were made for the general population 16 and over in the seven cities. These statistically derived estimates for the population are used throughout this report.

Victimization surveys can give us information about most, but not all types of crimes which are of major concern to the general public. Crimes such as murder, kidnapping, crimes against commerical establishments and "victimless" crimes cannot be captured using survey techniques, and were therefore excluded.

---

(2) The survey excluded commerical and institutional telephones.
(3) A full description of the boundaries for each area is given in Appendix A.

The eight categories of crimes included in this survey are: sexual assault, robbery, assault, break and entry, motor vehicle theft, theft of personal property, theft of household property and vandalism. These offences are ranked in descending order of seriousness.

Definitions and Limitations

1. Sexual assault includes rape, attempted rape, molesting or attempted molestation, and is considered the most serious crime.

2. Robbery occurs if something is taken and the offender has a weapon or there is a threat or an attack. The presence of a weapon is assumed to imply a threat. Attempted robberies are also included in this offence category.

3. Assault involves the presence of a weapon or an attack or threat. Assault incidents may range from face-to-face verbal threats to an attack with extensive injuries.

4. Break and enter occurs if a dwelling is entered by someone who has no right to be there. "No right to be there" differentiates, for example, between a workman who is in a dwelling with the permission of the owner and steals something, and someone illegally entering the dwelling to take property.

The latter would be classified as a break and enter as are attempts to enter a dwelling if there is some evidence of force or knowledge of how the person tried to get in.

5. Motor vehicle theft involves the theft or attempted theft of a car, truck, van, motorcycle or other motor vehicle.

6. Theft or attempted theft of money or other personal property (not household property).

7. Theft or attempted theft of household property.

8. Vandalism occurs if property is damaged but not taken.

Incidents which involved the commission of several different criminal acts appear in the tables only once, according to the most serious component of the event. Thus for example, if sexual assault, theft of money and vandalism all occurred at the same time, the incident would be classified in these tables as sexual assault. An incident would be classified as vandalism (least serious on the hierarchy) only if no other crime which is higher on the seriousness scale occurred at the same time.

Analyses in this report are based on the general offence categories outlined above. At a later date it will be possible to make more refined distinctions between and within offence categories

according to other factors such as: whether the incident was only attempted or completed; amount of damage, injury or financial loss incurred; type of weapon used; response of victims; location and time of offence; number of offenders; number of victims; characteristics of offenders; characteristics of victims.

Uniform Crime Reports and Victimization Surveys

One of the persistent problems faced by law enforcers, policy makers and researchers alike has been the inability to determine the "true" incidence and distribution of crime in the community. Although Uniform Crime Reports now provide national statistics which are based upon standardized definitions of crimes and standardized counting procedures, a significant gap still exists between the number of cases recorded in these reports, and the so-called "dark" number of actual crimes.

It is now well recognized that there are two levels of decision-making which affect U.C.R. statistics. On the first level, victims or witnesses must decide whether to report or not to report given incidents to police. Then, if a report is made, police officials in turn must decide whether the incident in question warrants being recorded as a crime or not. Complex decision-making processes are in play at both levels of this screening process. We

know that there are regional and inter-category variations in victim and witness reporting practices, and in police recording practices, but until now we have been unable to measure these differences with assurance.

Data obtained from victimization surveys provide an important complement to official police statistics because they address the issue of "dark" number of actual crimes directly. Victims are asked to describe both reported and unreported incidents, and to give their reasons for non-reporting(4). Such information allows us to develop historical and cross regional estimates of reporting rates, allows some measure of how victims define incidents, and generally provides us with a better understanding of the functioning of the criminal justice system from the perspective of the victim.

It is important to note, however, that these survey findings are not meant to replace Uniform Crime Reports, since they are clearly less comprehensive than the U.C.R. in some important respects. As mentioned earlier, certain crimes such as murder or white collar crime cannot be captured using survey techniques and are therefore omitted, and the range of victims is similarly restricted. In the present survey, for example, incidents involving victims who live in

---

(4) Two of the special problems of victimization studies, the problems of "series crimes" and of "telescoping" are both concerned to some extent with the vagaries of memory and recall. These questions are discussed briefly in Appendix B.

rural areas, victims who have no telephones or victims who are under 16 years of age are excluded. Similarly, our data include crimes committed against residents of the seven urban centres wherever these crimes may have occurred, but do not include crimes against non-residents (tourists or commuters) which may have occurred while they were in the city.

Reported and Unreported Incidents

This survey shows that the type of personal victimization most commonly experienced in the seven cities during 1981 was theft of personal property, followed by assault, robbery and sexual assault. The most frequent household victimization was theft of household property, followed by break and enter and vandalism. There were relatively fewer motor vehicle thefts (see Table 1).

More than half of the incidents described to interviewers (58.5%) were never brought to the attention of the police. Montreal had the lowest overall proportion of unreported incidents (55.0%), and Vancouver had the highest proportion (61.9%). Table 2 gives the percentage of unreported incidents in each city and for the seven cities combined by offence category, and also gives the overall percentage of unreported incidents in each of the cities. The 7% diference between the city with lowest overall rate of unreported incidents (Montreal = 55.0%), and the city with the highest rate (Vancouver = 61.9%) is relatively low, and is in fact smaller than the difference in rates within cities by offence categories.

Combining results from the seven cities we find that the crime least likely to be unreported was theft or attempted theft of a motor vehicle (30% unreported), and the crime most likely to remain unreported was theft of personal property (71% of unreported). These seven-city averages mask considerable differences between the cities, however, and it should be noted for example that there is a 35% difference between the city with the lowest proportion of unreported sexual assaults (Montreal), and the city with the highest proportion of unreported sexual assaults (Edmonton). Slightly fewer than 15% of all sexual assaults described to interviewers in Edmonton were reported to police - the lowest rate of reporting for any offence category in any of the seven cities.

The second largest inter-city difference (22%) was for reporting of vandalism - the least serious of the offence categories. There was a 15% range in reporting rates for assaults, and a 10% range in reporting of motor vehicle thefts. There is little apparent consistency in the rank ordering of cities by tendency to report incidents, for example, four of the seven cities ranked both highest and lowest in unreported incidents for different offences (Table 2).

Females had a higher reporting rate than males for sexual assault, robbery and for assault (Table 3), and generally speaking these 65 and over were also more likely to report incidents than younger victims.

The most common reasons given for failure to report an offence were that the incident was "too minor" (mentioned in two-thirds of the incidents in which no report was made); that "police could do nothing about it anyway" (61%); and that "it was too inconvenient" to make a report or victims "did not want to take the time" (24%) (Table 4).(5) Females have a higher reporting rate than males overall, particularly regarding sexual assault, robbery and assault. Generally speaking, those 65 and over are more likely to report incidents than are younger victims.

When reasons for non-report are analysed by offence category it becomes clear that the pattern of reasons given by sexual assault victims varied from the average in some important respects (Table 5). The most common reason given by sexual assault victims for failure to report was that police could not do anything about it (52%), followed by 43% who cited concern about the attitude of police or courts towards this type of incident. The overall percentage of non-reporting victims giving this reason was only 8.

Fear of revenge by the offender was also exceptionally common, and was mentioned by 53% of the sexual assault victims. Overall only 4% of all non-reporting victims gave this reason for their inaction.

---

(5) Percentages do not add to 100 since victims could give more than one reason for failure to report any one incident.

Risk of Victimization

When incidents are divided into the two general categories of personal offences and household offences it is possible to calculate rates per thousand population or per thousand households(6). Table 6 shows that 70.3 incidents of personal theft per thousand population occurred in the seven cities studied, and that the more serious the type of incidents, the less likely it was to occur. Sex differences are considerable for each category. Not surprisingly, women are seven times more likely than men to be victims of sexual assault (including rape, attempted rape, sexual molesting and attempted sexual molesting), but they are also more likely than men to be victims of personal theft. Men are almost twice as likely as women to be victims of robbery or assault (see Table 6). Tables 7.1 to 7.7 give the incident rates for each of the seven cities.

Vancouver incident rates were at or above the national average for all personal and household crime categories. Vancouver had the highest rates of assault (84.6), theft of personal property (91.3) and vandalism (122.2).

---

(6) Due to low sample numbers in some categories, caution must be exercised in comparing rates marked with a single asterisk (*). Rates marked with two asterisks (**) are based on 10 or fewer sample cases and are consequently statistically unreliable. They are given here for illustrative purposes only, and should not be quoted.

Edmonton had the second highest rate of sexual assault (4.1 per 1,000 population), but the incident rates for all other crime categories were not exceptional as compared to the other cities.

Winnipeg had the highest rate of any city for household theft (242.8), but otherwise fell near the national average rate for each type of offence.

Incidents rates in Toronto fell below the national average in every offence category. Toronto had the second lowest rate per thousands households for break and enter (69.4), and the lowest rates for motor vehicle theft (8.4), theft of household property (132.2) and vandalism (67.6).

Montreal had the highest rates of the seven cities for sexual assault (4.3), break and enter (121.9) and motor vehicle theft (23.3); the second highest rate of robbery (11.8); and the lowest rate of the seven for assault (44.9).

Halifax had one of the lowest rates recorded for sexual assault (1.5), but was highest in robbery rates (13.3), and second highest in assault (60.7) and theft of personal property (82.0). Incident rates for all household crimes were in the middle range of the cities studied.

Although numbers were too low to calculate rates accurately, St. John's clearly had the lowest rate of sexual assault of any of the cities studied. It also had the lowest incident rate for robbery (5.9) and break and enter (54.5), and the second lowest rates for assault (50.2) and motor vehicle theft (14.8).

Risk of victimization is closely tied to age. Those under 25 had the highest rate of victimization in all categories of personal offences, and these high rates decline rapidly with increasing age after this point (Table 8).

Perceptions of Crime: Concerns and Fears

A number of questions were asked concerning respondents' feelings of safety while walking alone during the day and at night, and about their perceptions of crime levels and trends in their neighbourhood and in their city.

On a national level, the vast majority (95%) stated that they felt safe or very safe walking alone during the day, and 5% said they felt somewhat unsafe or very unsafe (see Tables 9 and 10). For all cities between 91 and 98% of the residents said they felt safe.

After dark, fewer people felt safe walking alone in their own neighbourhoods (60%), but they still form a distinct majority. The proportion who felt safe after dark ranged from 51 to 69% for the seven cities (see Tables 10.1-10.7).

Vancouver was quite close to the national average on both measures, with 98% of the residents stating they felt safe during the day, and 63% after dark.

Edmonton was close to the national average with 97% feeling safe during the day and 58% feeling safe after dark.

Winnipeg showed a very similar proportion who felt safe in the daytime, but 5% fewer (55%) felt safe after dark.

Toronto had the highest proportion of citizens who said they felt safe during the day (98%), and was above average in the proportion who felt safe after dark (69%).

Montreal residents were less likely to say they felt safe either during the day (91%) or after dark (51%) than residents of any other city studied.

As many Halifax residents as those from other cities said they felt safe during the day, but the proprotion who said they felt safe at night (52%) is lower than for most other cities.

A very high proportion of the St. John's population said they felt safe or very safe during the day (97%), and 61% (marginally above the national average) said they felt safe walking alone at night.

A large majority thought the level of crime in their own neighbourhood was average (31%), or low (50%). By contrast, only 12% thought that the level of crime in their neighbourhood was high (Table 11). Those who had been victimized during 1981 had less positive opinions about the local crime situation (18% thought the level of crime was high), but 78% still rated their neighbourhood as having average or low levels. Understandably, more victims than non-victims also perceived that the crime problem in their neighbourhood was "serious" (Table 12), but a surprising 70% still said that the crime problem was not serious.

Vancouver residents had similar perceptions about levels of crime in their own neighbourhood, but they were slightly more likely to view the neighbourhood crime problem as being "serious" (Tables 13.1 and 14.1.)

Fewer Edmonton residents (7% overall, 11% of victims) thought their neighbourhood crime levels were high, and the proportion who said there was a serious crime problem in their neighbourhood was 5-6% lower than the average for all victim status categories. (Tables 13.2 and 14.2.)

Compared to the average of the seven cities in the study, Winnipeg victims were less likely to perceive high levels of crime in their own neighbourhoods. Views about the seriousness of the neighbourhood crime problem matched the national average almost exactly for both victims and non-victims. (Tables 13.3 and 14.3.)

Toronto residents were less likely to perceive high levels of crime in their own neighbourhoods, and approximately 5% fewer victims and non-victims described the local crime problem as "serious". (Tables 13.4 and 14.4.)

Montreal residents were more likely than others to perceive a high level of crime in their own neighbourhoods, and to view the overall neighbourhood crime problem as being "serious". Despite larger "don't know" response rates among non-victims, twice as many (18%) said neighbourhood crime levels were high. Twenty-nine percent of Montreal victims said crime levels were high, compared to 18% of all national urban victims. (Tables 13.5 and 14.5.)

Halifax residents shared the perceptions of most residents in the seven cities regarding level of crime in their neighbourhood, but they were nonetheless slightly more likely to say that the crime problem was serious (Tables 13.6 and 14.6).

St. John's residents were much more likely than others to say that neighbourhood crime levels were low, and to say that there was <u>not</u> a serious crime problem, even if they had been victimized within the previous year (Tables 13.7 and 14.7).

Perceptions of Police Performance

Residents of the seven cities were more likely than not to give police an "average" or "good" rating on law enforcement, promptness in responding to calls, approachability and provision of information to public on ways to reduce crime. In all categories, victims were more likely to give poor ratings than were non-victims, and overall least satisfaction was expressed with regard to information supplied on crime prevention (Tables 15 and 16.1 to 16.7).

Perceptions of Police Case-Handling

Eighty-two percent of the victims who contacted the police rated them as average or good in their overall handling of the case (range 71-88% in all seven cities), but 30% of these victims gave police a poor rating in keeping them informed about the progress of the case. Least likely to be satisfied were the victims of sexual assault and robbery. Vancouver victims were among the most critical on all rating items, (Tables 17 and 18.1).

Although a full 24% of Edmonton victims said police were poor at keeping them informed about the progress of their case, this is a lower proportion than in any other city (Tables 16 and 17).

Winnipeg victims were more likely than most to give poor ratings on all aspects of police case handling (Table 18.3).

Toronto police fared better than most on victim ratings of their handling of incidents (Table 18.4).

Montreal and Halifax police were very close to the average on all ratings by victims who had contract with them (Tables 18.5 and 18.6).

St. John's victims rated their police higher than most regarding promptness and courtesy, but gave more poor ratings for keeping victims informed of case progress, and overall case handling (Table 18.7).

Awareness and Use of Crime Prevention Programs

Most residents in the seven cities had some awareness of Block Parents programs (73%) and Operation Identification (51%), but less than half (42%) had heard of Neighbourhood Watch. As the ranges indicate, proportions aware of each program varied widely from city to city (Tables 19 and 20.1 to 20.7).

The proportion who participated in Operation Identification varied from 4% in one city (where awareness of the program was also very low), to a high of 26% in the city with the highest level of awareness of the program. In all cities, victims were more likely to be aware of each program than non-victims, and to participate in Operation Identification.

Awareness of Crime Compensation Programs

Criminal injuries compensation programs were not well known or well understood by victims or the general public (Tables 21 and 22.1 to 22.7). This general lack of knowledge even extended to those few victims (0.7% of the population) who sought medical or dental treatment as the result of injuries received, and who might therefore have been eligible for compensation in any of the provinces concerned. Among the minority who did claim knowledge about the schemes, misinformation about eligiblity was commonplace.

Vancouver stood out from other cities in this regard since a full 40% of treated victims and 29% of the general population were aware of the program.

In Montreal, victims seeking treatment seemed to be even less aware of the compensation scheme than were other victims and those who had suffered no victimization in 1981.

St. John's residents were markedly less aware of compensation provisions than urban residents in any other province surveyed.

Seven Cities

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF INCIDENTS OF SELECTED TYPES AND PROPORTION NOT REPORTED TO POLICE

Type of Incident	Number of Incidents	Percent of All Incidents	Percent Unreported
Sexual Assault	17,217	1.1	61.5
Robbery	49,327	3.1	55.1
Assault	285,739	17.8	65.5
Break & Enter	227,447	14.2	36.0
Motor Vehicle Theft	40,645	2.5	29.6
Personal Theft	349,893	21.9	70.6
Household Theft	417,274	26.1	55.5
Vandalism	213,089	13.3	65.3
Total	1,600,675	100.0	58.5

TABLE 2

PROPORTION OF UNREPORTED INCIDENTS BY TYPE OF CRIME IN SEVEN CITIES

	Vancouver	Edmonton	Winnipeg	Toronto	Montreal	Halifax	St. John's	Seven Cities	Range	% Diff.
Sexual Assault	68.1 (5)(1)	85.2 (7)	66.9 (4)	59.6 (2)	50.4 (1)	71.4 (6)	60.0 (3)	61.5	(50.4 - 85.2)	34.8
Robbery	56.8 (6)	53.5 (1)	57.8 (7)	53.7 (2)	54.9 (3)	55.1 (4)	56.5 (5)	55.1	(53.5 - 57.8)	4.3
Assault	65.7 (4)	68.4 (6)	76.6 (7)	64.3 (2)	61.4 (1)	65.1 (3)	67.3 (5)	65.5	(61.4 - 76.7)	15.3
Break & Enter	38.7 (7)	38.0 (5)	37.7 (4)	35.2 (3)	33.9 (2)	38.6 (6)	32.0 (1)	36.0	(32.0 - 38.7)	6.7
Motor Vehicle Theft	28.9 (6)	23.1 (1)	27.2 (4)	28.2 (5)	33.1 (7)	26.3 (3)	25.5 (2)	29.6	(23.1 - 33.1)	10.0
Personal Theft	71.1 (4)	70.2 (3)	74.9 (7)	70.0 (2)	69.3 (1)	71.9 (5)	74.2 (6)	70.6	(69.3 - 74.9)	5.6
Household Theft	60.7 (7)	53.9 (4)	53.4 (3)	54.0 (5)	54.2 (6)	51.7 (1)	52.0 (2)	55.5	(51.7 - 60.7)	9.0
Vandalism	70.9 (6)	61.4 (2)	62.4 (3)	63.2 (4)	64.1 (5)	59.9 (1)	73.4 (7)	65.3	(59.9 - 73.4)	22.5
Total	61.9 (7)	58.4 (4)	59.6 (5)	58.3 (3)	55.0 (1)	58.1 (2)	61.1 (6)	58.5	(55.0 - 61.9)	6.9

(1) Numbers in brackets indicate the rank-ordering of cities within offence categories. A "1" indicates the city with the lowest percentage of unreported incidents, and a "7" the city with the highest percentage.

TABLE 3

Seven Cities — PROPORTION OF UNREPORTED INCIDENTS BY TYPE OF CRIME AND BY SEX OF VICTIM

	MALES			FEMALES			Total Incidents	% Unrep.
	Incidents	% Off. Type	% Unrep.	Incidents	% Off. Type	% Unrep.		
Sexual Assault	1,770	10.3	65.9	15,447	89.7	61.0	17,217	61.5
Robbery	30,276	61.3	64.0	19,080	38.6	41.1	49,372	55.1
Assault	180,492	63.8	69.6	104,783	36.7	58.4	285,684	65.5
Personal Theft	151,679	43.4	72.1	197,458	56.4	69.5	349,835	70.6
Total Incidents	364,217	51.9	70.2	336,768	48.0	64.0	700,985	67.3

TABLE 4

REASONS GIVEN FOR FAILURE TO REPORT INCIDENTS TO POLICE BY CITY(1)

	Vancouver	Edmonton	Winnipeg	Toronto	Montreal	Halifax	St. John's	Seven Cities	Range	Diff.
Nothing Taken	20.4	20.9	16.8	17.5	21.5	17.0	16.1	19.4	(16.1 - 21.5)	5.4
Police Couldn't Do Anything	66.4	60.5	61.1	59.7	57.6	59.5	62.5	61.1	(57.6 - 66.4)	8.8
Fear Revenge	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.7	3.6	4.7	6.2	4.4	(3.6 - 6.2)	2.6
Protect Offender	6.6	6.0	7.3	7.2	5.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	(5.5 - 7.3)	1.8
Too Minor	68.9	62.1	64.2	65.7	65.4	57.9	62.6	65.7	(57.9 - 68.9)	11.0
Inconvenience	28.8	22.2	22.7	28.2	17.5	16.6	26.2	24.2	(16.6 - 28.8)	12.2
Personal Matter	13.4	15.2	12.9	15.4	10.7	10.2	13.6	13.3	(10.2 - 15.2)	5.0
Reported to Another Official	13.4	12.1	10.8	15.4	6.3	15.0	12.8	11.8	(6.3 - 15.4)	9.1
Concern About Attitude of Police & Courts	12.6	6.1	11.0	7.8	3.1	7.6	13.1	8.1	(3.1 - 12.6)	9.5
Overall % Unreported	61.9	58.4	59.6	57.6	55.0	58.1	61.1	58.5		
Number Unreported	234,282	78,704	90,409	248,521	231,380	26,049	12,572	921,099		
Total Incidents	385,420	135,819	154,993	431,495	425,820	46,029	21,099	1,600,675		

(1) Percentages are of incidents not reported to police. Columns do not add to 100% since more than one reason could be given for failure to report any incident.

TABLE 5

PROPORTION OF NON-REPORT VICTIMS GIVING EACH REASON FOR FAILURE TO REPORT INCIDENTS TO THE POLICE, BY OFFENCE CATEGORY

	Sexual Assault	Robbery	Assault	B&E	Theft M.V.	Per. Theft	H.H. Theft	Vanda-lism	Overall %	Number
Nothing Taken	33.2	47.1	27.8	42.2	51.3	6.2	7.9	28.0	19.4	179,288
Police Couldn't Do Anything	52.0	54.5	50.9	57.5	63.7	63.7	64.5	69.1	61.1	563,566
Fear Revenge	33.2	10.3	11.4	0.3	1.8	1.8	1.4	2.0	4.4	40,397
Protect Offender	15.8	9.2	15.7	0.9	5.1	5.1	2.8	2.7	6.5	59,932
Too Minor	26.2	56.4	63.2	55.7	62.2	62.2	70.9	73.3	65.7	606,378
Inconvenience	11.3	32.6	24.2	18.6	23.8	23.8	25.9	25.0	24.2	223,783
Personal Matter	27.2	21.7	28.8	4.2	12.6	12.6	6.7	5.5	13.3	122,594
Reported to Another Official	8.8	6.6	7.1	3.3	26.6	26.6	7.2	4.3	11.8	109,067
Negative Attitude of Police	42.7	14.3	11.8	4.9	5.1	5.1	7.1	6.5	8.1	74,515
Overall % Unreported	61.5	55.1	65.5	29.7	70.6	70.6	55.5	65.3	58.5	
Number Unreported	10,572	27,030	185,042	80,534	11,929	242,785	227,101	136,134		921,099

Columns do no add to 100% since respondents could indicate more than one reasonf or failure to report any one incident.

Seven Cities

TABLE 6

INCIDENT RATES

Personal Offences

Total population in seven cities = 4,975,904

Type of Incident	N	Rates per 1000 Population			Range
		Total	Males	Females	Total
Sexual Assaults	17,217	3.5	0.8	5.8	(1.5 - 4.3)
Robbery	49,372	10.0	13.3	7.2	(5.9 - 13.3)
Assault	285,739	57.4	79.1	39.3	(44.9 - 84.6)
Personal Theft	349,893	70.3	66.5	74.0	(61.0 - 91.3)

Household Offences

Total households in seven cities = 2,424,902

Type of Incident	N	Rate per 1000 Households	Range
Break and Enter	227,447	93.8	(54.5 - 121.9)
M.V. Theft	40,645	16.8	(8.4 - 23.3)
Household Theft	417,274	172.1	(132.2 - 242.8)
Vandalism	213,089	87.9	(67.6 - 122.2)

Vancouver

TABLE 7.1

INCIDENT RATES

Personal Offences

Total population in Vancouver = 913,182

Type of Incident	N	Rates per 1000 Population		
		Total	Males	Females
Sexual Assaults	3,494	3.8	0.6**	6.9
Robbery	10,951	12.0	15.1	9.2
Assault	77,214	84.6	112.7	57.8
Personal Theft	83,394	91.3	84.8	97.5

Household Offences

Total households in Vancouver = 458,763

Type of Incident	N	Rate per 1000 Households
Break and Enter	46,351	101.0
M.V. Theft	9,974	21.7
Household Theft	97,955	213.5
Vandalism	56,087	122.2

** Rates are based on 10 or fewer sample cases and are consequently statistically unreliable. They are given here for illustrative purposes only and should not be quoted.

Edmonton

TABLE 7.2

INCIDENT RATES

Personal Offences

Total population in Edmonton = 404,505

Type of Incident	N	Rates per 1000 Population		
		Total	Males	Females
Sexual Assaults	1,670	4.1	1.4**	6.5
Robbery	3,769	9.3	12.2	6.8
Assault	23,177	57.3	79.9	37.5
Personal Theft	29,121	72.0	74.2	69.8

Household Offences

Total households in Edmonton = 198,601

Type of Incident	N	Rate per 1000 Households
Break and Enter	17,032	85.8
M.V. Theft	3,406	17.2
Household Theft	40,601	204.4
Vandalism	17,044	85.8

** Rates are based on 10 or fewer sample cases and are consequently statistically unreliable. They are given here for illustrative purposes only and should not be quoted.

Winnipeg

TABLE 7.3

INCIDENT RATES

Personal Offences

Total population in Winnipeg = 423,762

Type of Incident	N	Rates per 1000 Population		
		Total	Males	Females
Sexual Assaults	1,512	3.6	1.3**	5.3
Robbery	3,796	9.0	13.0	5.9
Assault	23,432	55.3	80.9	35.4
Personal Theft	27,878	65.8	63.9	67.3

Household Offences

Total households in Winnipeg = 212,555

Type of Incident	N	Rate per 1000 Households
Break and Enter	21,099	99.3
M.V. Theft	3,661	17.2
Household Theft	51,605	242.8
Vandalism	22,011	103.6

** Rates are based on 10 or fewer sample cases and are consequently statistically unreliable. They are given here for illustrative purposes only and should not be quoted.

Toronto

TABLE 7.4

INCIDENT RATES

Personal Offences

Total population in Toronto = 1,689,406

Type of Incident	N	Rates per 1000 Population		
		Total	Males	Females
Sexual Assaults	4,479	2.6	0	4.9
Robbery	12,912	7.6	11.6	4.3
Assault	90,006	53.3	74.1	35.5
Personal Theft	103,223	61.0	53.2	67.9

Household Offences

Total households in Toronto = 795,653

Type of Incident	N	Rate per 1000 Households
Break and Enter	55,185	69.4
M.V. Theft	6,712	8.4
Household Theft	105,153	132.2
Vandalism	53,825	67.6

Montreal

TABLE 7.5

INCIDENT RATES

Personal Offences

Total population in Montreal = 1,338,557

Type of Incident	N	Rates per 1000 Population		
		Total	Males	Females
Sexual Assaults	5,754	4.3	1.6**	6.6
Robbery	15,731	11.8	14.4	9.6
Assault	60,132	44.9	58.5	34.0
Personal Theft	90,266	67.4	66.2	68.5

Household Offences

Total households in Montreal = 664,056

Type of Incident	N	Rate per 1000 Households
Break and Enter	80,951	121.9
M.V. Theft	15,454	23.3
Household Theft	102,470	154.3
Vandalism	55,063	82.9

** Rates are based on 10 or fewer sample cases and are consequently statistically unreliable. They are given here for illustrative purposes only and should not be quoted.

Halifax

TABLE 7.6

INCIDENT RATES

Personal Offences

Total population in 134,434

Type of Incident	N	Rates per 1000 Population		
		Total	Males	Females
Sexual Assaults	208	1.5	0.5**	2.4
Robbery	1,788	13.3	16.2	10.9
Assault	8,163	60.7	89.5	38.4
Personal Theft	11,022	82.0	79.8	83.3

Household Offences

Total households in Halifax = 65,791

Type of Incident	N	Rate per 1000 Households
Break and Enter	5,223	79.4
M.V. Theft	999	15.2
Household Theft	12,678	192.7
Vandalism	5,948	90.4

** Rates are based on 10 or fewer sample cases and are consequently statistically unreliable. They are given here for illustrative purposes only and should not be quoted.

St. John's

TABLE 7.7

INCIDENT RATES

Personal Offences

Total population in St. John's = 72,060

Type of Incident	N	Rates per 1000 Population		
		Total	Males	Females
Sexual Assaults	*	*	*	*
Robbery	426	5.9	7.6	4.5
Assault	3,615	50.2	73.3	30.6
Personal Theft	4,991	69.3	70.7	68.2

Household Offences

Total households in St. John's = 29,484

Type of Incident	N	Rate per 1000 Households
Break and Enter	1,607	54.5
M.V. Theft	437	14.8
Household Theft	6,813	231.1
Vandalism	3,111	105.5

* The number of incidents identified was so low that no reliable population estimates could be made, although St. John's clearly had the lowest rate of sexual assault of the seven cities surveyed.

Seven Cities

TABLE 8

INCIDENT RATES PER THOUSAND POPULATION BY AGE CATEGORY

	16-17	18-20	21-24	25-29	30-39	40-49	50-59	60-64	65+
Sexual Assault	6*	14	6	3	3	1**	1**	1**	0**
Robbery	24	22	19	11	7	5	4	8*	4
Assault	131	142	107	79	50	26	14	16	8
Personal Theft	156	139	122	86	64	48	31	27	13

_____ Highest rate for each offence category.

* Low sample numbers in this category mean that caution should be exercised when interpreting this rate.

** Rates are based on 10 or fewer sample cases and are consequently statistically unreliable. They are given here for illustrative purposes only, and should not be quoted.

Updated November 5, 1984

Seven Cities

TABLE 9

FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE IN NEIGHBOURHOOD

	During Day	After Dark
	%	%
Safe	95	60
Unsafe	5	40
Total	100	100

Vancouver

TABLE 10.1

FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE IN NEIGHBOURHOOD

	During Day	After Dark
	%	%
Safe	98	63
Unsafe	2	37
Total	100	100

Edmonton

TABLE 10.2

FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE IN NEIGHBOURHOOD

	During Day	After Dark
	%	%
Safe	97	58
Unsafe	3	42
Total	100	100

Winnipeg

TABLE 10.3

FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE IN NEIGHBOURHOOD

	During Day	After Dark
	%	%
Safe	96	55
Unsafe	4	45
Total	100	100

Toronto

TABLE 10.4

FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE IN NEIGHBOURHOOD

	During Day	After Dark
	%	%
Safe	98	69
Unsafe	2	31
Total	100	100

Montreal

TABLE 10.5

FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE IN NEIGHBOURHOOD

	During Day %	After Dark %
Safe	91	51
Unsafe	9	49
Total	100	100

Halifax

TABLE 10.6

FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE IN NEIGHBOURHOOD

	During Day %	After Dark %
Safe	96	52
Unsafe	4	48
Total	100	100

St. John's

TABLE 10.7

FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE IN NEIGHBOURHOOD

	During Day	After Dark
	%	%
Safe	97	61
Unsafe	3	39
Total	100	100

Seven Cities

TABLE 11

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF CRIME IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
Amount of Crime	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
High	12	9	18
Average	31	28	36
Low	50	54	42
Don't Know	7	9	5
Total	100	100	100

Seven Cities

TABLE 12

PERCEPTIONS OF SERIOUSNESS OF CRIME PROBLEM IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
Serious	17	13	25
Not Serious	77	80	70
Don't Know	6	7	4
Total	100	100	100

Vancouver

TABLE 13.1

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF CRIME IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD
BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
Amount of Crime	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
High	11	8	17
Average	33	30	38
Low	50	55	42
Don't Know	6	7	4
Total	100	100	100

Vancouver

TABLE 14.1

PERCEPTIONS OF SERIOUSNESS OF CRIME PROBLEM IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD
BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
Serious	21	17	28
Not Serious	74	77	68
Don't Know	5	6	4
Total	100	100	100

Edmonton

TABLE 13.2

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF CRIME IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
Amount of Crime	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
High	7	5	11
Average	30	26	35
Low	57	62	49
Don't Know	6	7	5
Total	100	100	100

Edmonton

TABLE 14.2

PERCEPTIONS OF SERIOUSNESS OF CRIME PROBLEM IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
Serious	13	9	19
Not Serious	82	85	77
Don't Know	5	5	4
Total	100	100	100

Winnipeg

TABLE 13.3

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF CRIME IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
Amount of Crime	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
High	8	6	11
Average	29	26	36
Low	58	63	50
Don't Know	5	6	3
Total	100	100	100

Winnipeg

TABLE 14.3

PERCEPTIONS OF SERIOUSNESS OF CRIME PROBLEM IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
Serious	17	13	25
Not Serious	78	82	71
Don't Know	5	5	4
Total	100	100	100

Toronto

TABLE 13.4

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF CRIME IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD
BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
Amount of Crime	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
High	8	6	13
Average	27	24	33
Low	60	64	51
Don't Know	5	6	3
Total	100	100	100

Toronto

TABLE 14.4

PERCEPTIONS OF SERIOUSNESS OF CRIME PROBLEM IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD
BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
Serious	13	10	20
Not Serious	83	85	77
Don't Know	4	5	3
Total	100	100	100

Montreal

TABLE 13.5

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF CRIME IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD
BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
Amount of Crime	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
High	21	18	29
Average	34	32	38
Low	32	35	26
Don't Know	13	15	7
Total	100	100	100

Montreal

TABLE 14.5

PERCEPTIONS OF SERIOUSNESS OF CRIME PROBLEM IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD
BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
Serious	21	16	31
Not Serious	68	72	62
Don't Know	11	12	7
Total	100	100	100

Halifax

TABLE 13.6

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF CRIME IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
Amount of Crime	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
High	12	10	17
Average	35	33	40
Low	48	52	40
Don't Know	4	5	3
Total	100	100	100

Halifax

TABLE 14.6

PERCEPTIONS OF SERIOUSNESS OF CRIME PROBLEM IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
Serious	22	18	28
Not Serious	74	77	69
Don't Know	4	5	3
Total	100	100	100

St. John's

TABLE 13.7

PERCEPTIONS OF LEVEL OF CRIME IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
Amount of Crime	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
High	5	3	9
Average	20	16	29
Low	72	78	60
Don't Know	3	3	2
Total	100	100	100

St. John's

TABLE 14.7

PERCEPTIONS OF SERIOUSNESS OF CRIME PROBLEM IN OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

	Percentage Distribution		
	Population	Non-Victims	Victims
Serious	10	6	18
Not Serious	88	92	80
Don't Know	2	2	2
Total	100	100	100

Seven Cities

TABLE 15

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

How Good Are Local Police At:	Ratings				
	Good	Average	Poor	Don't Know	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Enforcing the Laws					
Population	58	28	6	8	100
Non-Victims	61	25	5	9	100
Victims	53	33	8	6	100
Responding Promptly to Calls					
Population	49	16	8	26	100
Non-Victims	50	15	6	29	100
Victims	48	20	13	19	100
Being Approachable and Easy to Talk To					
Population	62	16	6	16	100
Non-Victims	63	13	4	19	100
Victims	61	20	9	11	100
Supplying Crime Reduction Information					
Population	41	21	17	20	100
Non-Victims	43	20	15	23	100
Victims	39	24	22	15	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Vancouver

TABLE 16.1

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

How Good Are Local Police At:	Ratings				
	Good	Average	Poor	Don't Know	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Enforcing the Laws					
Population	54	33	6	7	100
Non-Victims	58	29	5	8	100
Victims	48	38	9	5	100
Responding Promptly to Calls					
Population	47	16	9	27	100
Non-Victims	48	14	6	32	100
Victims	47	20	12	21	100
Being Approachable and Easy to Talk To					
Population	65	15	5	16	100
Non-Victims	66	12	4	18	100
Victims	63	19	6	11	100
Supplying Crime Reduction Information					
Population	42	23	16	20	100
Non-Victims	43	21	13	23	100
Victims	39	26	19	15	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Edmonton

TABLE 16.2

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

How Good Are Local Police At:	Ratings				
	Good	Average	Poor	Don't Know	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Enforcing the Laws					
Population	55	33	5	6	100
Non-Victims	58	31	4	7	100
Victims	51	37	8	5	100
Responding Promptly to Calls					
Population	44	20	10	26	100
Non-Victims	44	19	7	30	100
Victims	44	20	15	21	100
Being Approachable and Easy to Talk To					
Population	62	18	6	15	100
Non-Victims	62	17	4	17	100
Victims	60	20	9	11	100
Supplying Crime Reduction Information					
Population	53	22	11	14	100
Non-Victims	54	20	10	15	100
Victims	50	24	14	12	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Winnipeg

TABLE 16.3

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

How Good Are Local Police At:	Ratings: Good %	Average %	Poor %	Don't Know %	Total %
Enforcing the Laws	49	36	8	8	100
Population	51	33	6	10	100
Non-Victims	45	40	10	5	100
Victims					
Responding Promptly to Calls	35	22	14	30	100
Population	35	20	10	35	100
Non-Victims	35	24	19	21	100
Victims					
Being Approachable and Easy to Talk To	60	18	6	17	100
Population	60	16	4	20	100
Non-Victims	60	21	8	11	100
Victims					
Supplying Crime Reduction Information	37	25	18	20	100
Population	37	24	16	23	100
Non-Victims	37	25	22	16	100
Victims					

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Toronto

TABLE 16.4

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

How Good Are Local Police At:	Ratings				
	Good	Average	Poor	Don't Know	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Enforcing the Laws					
Population	69	21	4	6	100
Non-Victims	71	19	3	7	100
Victims	64	26	6	4	100
Responding Promptly to Calls					
Population	58	13	5	24	100
Non-Victims	58	11	4	27	100
Victims	59	16	9	16	100
Being Approachable and Easy to Talk To					
Population	71	13	5	11	100
Non-Victims	71	11	5	13	100
Victims	69	17	8	6	100
Supplying Crime Reduction Information					
Population	41	19	18	22	100
Non-Victims	42	18	15	24	100
Victims	38	21	24	17	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Montreal

TABLE 16.5

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

How Good Are Local Police At:	Ratings				
	Good	Average	Poor	Don't Know	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Enforcing the Laws					
Population	53	28	7	12	100
Non-Victims	55	25	6	14	100
Victims	49	32	10	9	100
Responding Promptly to Calls					
Population	47	18	9	26	100
Non-Victims	48	16	6	29	100
Victims	44	23	13	20	100
Being Approachable and Easy to Talk To					
Population	52	17	7	23	100
Non-Victims	52	15	5	27	100
Victims	52	21	12	16	100
Supplying Crime Reduction Information					
Population	39	21	19	22	100
Non-Victims	41	19	16	25	100
Victims	36	25	24	16	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Halifax

TABLE 16.6

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

How Good Are Local Police At:	Ratings				
	Good	Average	Poor	Don't Know	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Enforcing the Laws					
Population	49	39	7	6	100
Non-Victims	52	36	5	7	100
Victims	42	45	9	3	100
Responding Promptly to Calls					
Population	46	18	8	28	100
Non-Victims	46	16	6	32	100
Victims	45	20	13	21	100
Being Approachable and Easy to Talk To					
Population	62	18	5	15	100
Non-Victims	62	16	4	18	100
Victims	61	21	8	10	100
Supplying Crime Reduction Information					
Population	41	26	19	14	100
Non-Victims	42	26	16	16	100
	38	27	25	10	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

St. John's

TABLE 16.7

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE BY POPULATION AND BY VICTIM STATUS

How Good Are Local Police At:	Ratings				
	Good	Average	Poor	Don't Know	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Enforcing the Laws					
Population	43	43	10	4	100
Non-Victims	47	41	7	5	100
Victims	35	46	16	3	100
Responding Promptly to Calls					
Population	35	23	15	28	100
Non-Victims	36	22	11	31	100
Victims	31	27	21	21	100
Being Approachable and Easy to Talk To					
Population	54	23	7	16	100
Non-Victims	55	21	5	18	100
Victims	52	26	10	12	100
Supplying Crime Reduction Information					
Population	48	27	14	11	100
Non-Victims	49	27	12	12	100
Victims	47	28	17	8	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Seven Cities

TABLE 17

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE CASE HANDLING

Aspects of Police Behaviour

Victim's Rating	Promptness	Courtesy	Keeping Informed	Overall Handling
	%	%	%	%
Good	75	73	51	58
Average	13	22	19	24
Poor	12	5	30	17
Total	100	100	100	100

Vancouver

TABLE 18.1

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE CASE HANDLING

Aspects of Police Behaviour

Victim's Rating	Promptness %	Courtesy %	Keeping Informed %	Overall Handling %
Good	70	77	44	54
Average	15	17	22	26
Poor	15	7	34	20
Total	100	100	100	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Edmonton

TABLE 18.2

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE CASE HANDLING

Aspects of Police Behaviour

Victim's Rating	Promptness %	Courtesy %	Keeping Informed %	Overall Handling %
Good	71	82	53	63
Average	16	14	23	23
Poor	13	4	24	15
Total	100	100	100	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Winnipeg

TABLE 18.3

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE CASE HANDLING

Aspects of Police Behaviour

Victim's Rating	Promptness	Courtesy	Keeping Informed	Overall Handling
	%	%	%	%
Good	68	75	46	54
Average	18	19	17	24
Poor	14	6	37	22
Total	100	100	100	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding

Toronto

TABLE 18.4

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE CASE HANDLING

Aspects of Police Behaviour

Victim's Rating	Promptness	Courtesy	Keeping Informed	Overall Handling
	%	%	%	%
Good	82	81	53	62
Average	10	14	19	26
Poor	8	5	28	12
Total	100	100	100	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding

Montreal

TABLE 18.5

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE CASE HANDLING

Aspects of Police Behaviour

Victim's Rating	Promptness %	Courtesy %	Keeping Informed %	Overall Handling %
Good	74	60	52	58
Average	13	36	18	22
Poor	12	4	30	20
Total	100	100	100	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding

Halifax

TABLE 18.6

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE CASE HANDLING

Aspects of Police Behaviour

Victim's Rating	Promptness %	Courtesy %	Keeping Informed %	Overall Handling %
Good	76	83	52	57
Average	14	14	18	25
Poor	10	3	30	19
Total	100	100	100	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding

St.John's

TABLE 18.7

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE CASE HANDLING

Victim's Rating	Aspects of Police Behaviour			
	Promptness	Courtesy	Keeping Informed	Overall Handling
	%	%	%	%
Good	63	74	40	46
Average	19	24	22	25
Poor	18	2	38	29
Total	100	100	100	100

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding

Seven Cities

TABLE 19

AWARENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

	Percent Aware of Program			Percent Participating
	Neighbourhood Watch	Block Parents	Operation Identification	Operation Identification
Victims	46	78	60	18
Non-Victims	40	71	47	14
Population Range	42 (23-84)	73 (62-92)	51 (30-82)	15 (4-26)

Vancouver

TABLE 20.1

AWARENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

	Percent Aware of Program			Percent Participating
	Neighbourhood Watch	Block Parents	Operation Identification	Operation Identification
Victims	89	78	86	25.9
Non-Victims	82	71	79	25.6
Population	84	74	82	25.7

Edmonton

TABLE 20.2

AWARENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

	Percent Aware of Program			Percent Participating
	Neighbourhood Watch	Block Parents	Operation Identification	Operation Identification
Victims	68	95	65	16
Non-Victims	61	91	56	13
Population	64	92	59	14

Winnipeg

TABLE 20.3

AWARENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

	Percent Aware of Program			Percent Participating
	Neighbourhood Watch	Block Parents	Operation Identification	Operation Identification
Victims	42	93	70	12
Non-Victims	38	87	56	9
Population	40	90	61	10

Toronto

TABLE 20.4

AWARENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

	Percent Aware of Program			Percent Participating
	Neighbourhood Watch	Block Parents	Operation Identification	Operation Identification
Victims	29	80	36	5
Non-Victims	26	70	29	4
Population	27	72	31	4

Montreal

TABLE 20.5

AWARENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

	Percent Aware of Program			Percent Participating
	Neighbourhood Watch	Block Parents	Operation Identification	Operation Identification
Victims	23	65	57	16
Non-Victims	24	60	44	12
Population	23	62	48	14

Halifax

TABLE 20.6

AWARENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

	Percent Aware of Program			Percent Participating
	Neighbourhood Watch	Block Parents	Operation Identification	Operation Identification
Victims	75	92	74	22
Non-Victims	71	88	67	18
Population	72	89	69	19

St. John's

TABLE 20.7

AWARENESS OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

	Percent Aware of Program			Percent Participating
	Neighbourhood Watch	Block Parents	Operation Identification	Operation Identification
Victims	53	76	75	10
Non-Victims	48	70	62	8
Population	49	72	67	9

Seven Cities

TABLE 21

AWARENESS OF CRIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS
BY VICTIM STATUS

	Victims Requiring Medical or Dental Treatment	Other Victims and Non-Victims
% Aware of Programs	27	24
% Not Aware of Programs	73	76
	100	100
Number of Cases	32,685	4,930,352
% of Population	0.7	99.3

Vancouver

TABLE 22.1

AWARENESS OF CRIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS
BY VICTIM STATUS

	Victims Requiring Medical or Dental Treatment	Other Victims and Non-Victims
% Aware of Programs	40	29
% Not Aware of Programs	60	71
	100	100
Number of Cases	9,132	904,188
% of Population	1.0	99.0

Edmonton
CRIME COMPENSATION PROGRAM

TABLE 22.2

AWARENESS OF
BY VICTIM STATUS

	Victims Requiring Medical or Dental Treatment	Other Victims and Non-Victims
% Aware of Programs	19	22
% Not Aware of Programs	82	78
	100	100
Number of Cases	2,333	401,897
% of Population	0.6	99.4

Winnipeg

TABLE 22.3

AWARENESS OF CRIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS
BY VICTIM STATUS

	Victims Requiring Medical or Dental Treatment	Other Victims and Non-Victims
% Aware of Programs	25	21
% Not Aware of Programs	75	79
	100	100
Number of Cases	2,694	421,096
% of Population	0.6	99.4

Toronto

TABLE 22.4

AWARENES OF CRIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS
BY VICTIM STATUS

	Victims Requiring Medical or Dental Treatment	Other Victims and Non-Victims
% Aware of Programs	25	24
% Not Aware of Programs	75	76
	100	100
Number of Cases	10,605	1,680,008
% of Population	0.6	99.4

Montreal

TABLE 22.5

AWARENESS OF CRIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS
BY VICTIM STATUS

	Victims Requiring Medical or Dental Treatment	Other Victims and Non-Victims
% Aware of Programs	17	22
% Not Aware of Programs	83	78
	100	100
Number of Cases	6,450	1,330,858
% of Population	0.5	99.5

Halifax

TABLE 22.6

AWARENESS OF CRIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS
BY VICTIM STATUS

	Victims Requiring Medical or Dental Treatment	Other Victims and Non-Victims
% Aware of Programs	22	22
% Not Aware of Programs	78	78
	100	100
Number of Cases	1,104	133,392
% of Population	0.8	99.2

St. John's

TABLE 22.7

AWARENESS OF CRIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS
BY VICTIM STATUS

	Victims Requiring Medical or Dental Treatment	Other Victims and Non-Victims
% Aware of Programs	9	8
% Not Aware of Programs	91	92
	100	100
Number of Cases	368	71,720
% of Population	0.5	99.5

APPENDIX A

The seven survey centres included in the Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (1982) were defined as follows using, in all cases, 1981 boundaries.

Survey Centre	Constituent Municipalities
St. John's*	St. John's (city) Mt. Pearl (town)
Halifax-Dartmouth	Halifax (city) Dartmouth (city)
Montreal	all municipalites located on the Island of Montreal (including Nun's Island)
Toronto	East York (bor) Etobicoke (bor) North York (city) Scarborough (bor) Toronto (city) York (bor)
Winnipeg	Winnipeg (city)
Edmonton*	Edmonton (city)
Greater Vancouver	Belcarra (vl) Burnaby (mun) Coquitlam (mun) Delta (mun) Lion's Bay (vl) New Westminster (city) North Vancouver (mun) North Vancouver (mun) Port Coquitlam (city) Port Moody (city) Surrey (mun) Richmond (mun) University Endowment Area Vancouver (city) West Vancouver (mun) White Rock (city)

The survey centres are defined in this way so as to coincide with local police force jurisdiction as well as to be comparable among themselves. The sole exception is Vancouver which is defined so as to be comparable to the 1979 Greater Vancouver Crime Survey.

---

* The city boundaries changed as of January 1, 1982. The 1981 city boundaries were employed.

APPENDIX B

Recall of Events

As with all surveys in which respondents are asked to recall past events, data from this victimization survey is subject to errors caused by faulty or incomplete memory. Because respondents are asked to report details on victimizations which may have taken place up to a full year earlier, some degree of inaccurate reporting of detail must be expected. Respondents may forget minor criminal incidents, or may fail to report incidents such as intra-familial assaults because they do not perceive that a criminal incident has occurred.

"Telescoping"

One particular type of recall phenomenon affecting victimization surveys is that of "telescoping" - the tendency of respondents to misplace events in time. The most problematic of various types of telescoping would be forward telescoping - the reporting of an incident which occurred prior to the reference period as occurring during the reference period. Although the extent of forward telescoping that occurred in this survey is unknown, the fact that a definite, well-defined reference period - January 1, 1981 to December 31, 1981 - was employed and emphasized would have helped to minimize this effect. Backward telescoping - (reporting an event as occurring during the reference period when, in fact, it occurred after the end of the reference period) - would not have been a significant factor since the survey was conducted in the weeks almost immediately following the end of the reference period.

"Series" Crimes

Another type of recall problem sometimes occurs, particularly if a respondent has been the victim of several (usually five or more) similar incidents, and is unable to clearly recall the details of each. While series crimes tend to be minor incidents they are significant because of their frequency and because they are often a feature of the every-day lives of some victims. There seems to be no completely satisfactory method of dealing with this problem.(1) In this report, series incidents are counted as one incident in the estimates for crimes. A separate report will focus on "series" victims.

---

(1) The most comprehensive and useful account of these problems can be found in Wesley G. Skogan, Issues in the Measurement of Victimization, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (NCJ-74682), 1981: 19-24.